REMARKS

Claims 1 – 32 are pending. By this amendment, the Title and claims 8, 13, and 27 are amended. No new matter is introduced. Reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Applicant thanks Examiners Khoshnoodi and Decady fo the courtesies extended to applicant's representative during a June 20, 2005 personal interview. The substance of that interview is incorporated in the remarks that follow.

On page 2 the Office Action objects to the Title as not descriptive. The Title is amended to read "Method And Apparatus For Controlling Execution Of A Computer Operation."

On page 2 the Office Action rejects claims 27 – 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0147801 to Gullotta st al. (hereafter Gullotta). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

CLAIM 27

The Office Action asserts that Gullota discloses all that is recited in claim 27. However, claim 27 is amended to include features disclosed in the specification at least at page 6, lines 10 – 17. Specifically, claim 27 is amended to recite operating an authorization plug-in in a check mode, comprising determining if all required plug-in parameters are specified and, if all required plug-in parameters are specified, operating the authorization plug-in in an execute mode. As discussed during the personal interview, these features are not disclosed or suggested in Gullota and hence, claim 27 is patentable.

Claims 28 – 31 depend from patentable claim 27, and for this reason and the additional features they recite, claims 28 – 31 are also patentable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 27 – 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 1

On page 4 the Office Action rejects claims 1 – 3, 6 – 8, 10 – 20, 23, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,842,903 to Weschler (hereafter Weschler) in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0016915 to Kumazawa et al. (hereafter Kumazawa). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Considering claim 1, the Office Action asserts, inter alia, that Weschler discloses the claimed features of "if the computer operation requires at least one plug-in, filtering any

required plug-in parameters from the one or more parameters specified with the computer operation," and "determining whether all required plug-in parameters for the at least one plug-in have been specified." In support of its assertion, the Office Action cites Weschler at column 8, lines 7-9 and lines 11-14.

The Office Action then admits that Weschler does not disclose other features of claim 1, specifically terminating the at least one plug-in with failure of not all the required plug-in parameters have been specified; executing the at least one plug-in if all the required plug-in parameters have been specified; and executing the computer operation of the at least one plug-in terminates with success, wherein the at least one plug-in regulates execution of the computer program. However, the Office Action asserts that Kumazawa discloses these elements missing from Weschler, and contends that it would have been obvious to combine Weschler and Kumazawa to produce the invention recited in claim 1.

As discussed during the personal interview, Wescheler is directed to a system that allows one application program running on a computer, which is part of a computer network, to access another application program on the same computer, or on another computer that is also part of the computer network. More specifically, the system allows a computer program to access compatible plug-in features that reside at a location remote from the computer program. The plug-in features may reside on a computer other than the one hosting the computer program. Alternatively, the plug-in features may be stored on the same computer as the computer program. See column 4, lines 15 –39. The plug-in features allow the computer to expand its core functionality to include the functionality of the plug-in features. See column 6, lines 29 – 34. To access the plug-in features, a core profile engine 201 receives an initialization parameter from a corresponding plug-in module, where the initialization parameter is the storage location of the plug-in module. See column 8, lines 5 – 9. Thus, the only plug-in parameter disclosed or discussed in Weschler is the address of the plug-in. Moreover, Weschler does not disclose or suggest any step related to determining if "all required plug-in parameters for the at least one plug-in have been satisfied." Also, Weschler does not disclose or suggest "filtering any required plug-in parameters from the one or more parameters specified with the computer operation." Instead, Weschler's system creates a runtime binding to the plug-in module, making "the program behavior embodied in the plug-in module ... available." See column 8, lines 10 – 14. Thus, there is no need to pass or filter parameters from the computer system (the core profile engine 201) to the plug-in module.

Kumazawa is directed to a system for authenticating data to be retrieved by a data terminal from a central server. An authentication routine SQ 15 is provided by plug-in Ptfc1. Operation of the authentication routine SQ 15 is described with respect to Figure 7. Specifically, the authentication routine SQ 15 determines if certain data, first locator Lent, is embedded as an electronic watermark with retrieved index data Didx as part of embedded graphic data Dbgpc. If the first locator Lent is not so embedded, the authentication routine SQ 15 terminates, and the data retrieval is prevented. See paragraph 41. If the first locator Lent is embedded, the first locator (now designated as Lwent) is compared to text locator Ltent. If Lwent and Ltent match, then the data retrieval is allowed. See paragraphs 42 and 43. Note that in the disclosed description of the authentication routine SQ 15, the plug-in Ptfc1 at no time checks to see if all the required plug-in parameters have been specified. The only value tested by the plug-in Ptfc1 is the first locator Lent. If the first locator Lent is not embedded, then the authentication routine SQ 15 terminates. Thus Kumazawa does not cure all the defects in Weschler, namely "determining whether all required plug-in parameters for the at least one plug-in have been satisfied." Furthermore, Kumazawa does not disclose or suggest "filtering any required plug-in parameters from the one or more parameters specified with the computer operation."

In contrast to Weschler and Kumazawa, claim 1 recites if the computer operation requires at least one plug-in, filtering a required plug-in parameters from the one or more parameters specified with the computer operation and determining whether all required plug-in parameters for the at least one plug-in have been specified. Since these features are not disclosed or suggested by Weschler and Kumazawa, individually and in combination, claim 1 is patentable.

CLAIM 11

Considering claim 11, the Office Action asserts that Weschler discloses the claimed subject matter. To support this assertion, the Office Action cites to Weschler at column 14, lines 1 – 14. This portion of Weschler consists of one element of Weschler's claim 16, followed by a wherein clause. The element is a pluggable interface that provides an initialization parameter. The wherein clause recites that the pluggable interface includes a service connector adapted to receive a service request and to return a reference. Nothing in the cited portions of Weschler's claim 16 discloses or suggests determining whether all the plug-in parameters required by the notification plug-in are specified before the computer operation, and executing the notification plug-in after execution of the computer operation.

Furthermore, no other part of Weschler discloses this feature, and Kumazawa does nothing to cure this defect in Weschler.

In contrast to Weschler (and Kumazawa), claim 11 recites "determining whether all of the plug-in parameters required by the notification plug-in are specified before the computer operation and executing the notification plug-in after execution of the computer operation, whereby the computer operation is not executed if the notification plug-in terminates with failure after determining whether all of the plug-in parameters are specified." Since, as discussed above, this feature is not disclosed or suggested by Weschler and Kumazawa, individually and in combination, claim 11 is patentable. Claim 11 is also patentable because of its dependence on patentable claim 1.

CLAIM 13

Considering claim 13, the Office Action asserts that the combination of Weschler and Kumazawa teaches or suggests all that is recited. However and as discussed during the personal interview, neither Weschler nor Kumazawa teach or suggest means for operating the at least one plug-in in a check mode.

In contrast to Weschler and Kumazawa, amended claim 13 recites means for operating the at least one plug-in in a check mode. Since Weschler and Kumazawa, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest this feature, claim 13 is patentable.

Claim 2, 3, 6 – 8, 10, and 12 depend from patentable claim 1 and claims 14 – 20, 23, 25, and 26 depend from patentable claim 13. For this reason, and the additional features they recite, claims 2, 3, 6 – 8, 10, 12, 14 – 20, 23, 25, and 26 are also patentable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 3, 6 – 8, 10 – 20, 23, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), is respectfully requested.

On page 12 the Office Action rejects claims 4, 5, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Weschler in view of Kumazawa and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,694,312 to Kobayashi et al. (hereafter Kobayashi). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 4 and 5 depend from patentable claim 1, and claims 21 and 22 depend from patentable claim 13. For this reason, and the additional features they recite, claims 4, 5, 21, and 22 are also patentable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4, 5, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), is respectfully requested.

On page 14 the Office Action rejects claims 9 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) 0ver Weschler in view of Kumazawa and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,857,067 to Edelman (hereafter Edelman). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 depends from patentable claim 1, and claim 24 depends from patentable claim 13. For this reason, and the additional features they recite, claims 1 and 24 are patentable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), is respectfully requested.

On page 15 the Office Action rejects claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Gullotta in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0174023 to Grey et al. (hereafter Grey). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 32 depends from patentable claim 27. For this reason and the additional features it recites, claim 32 is also patentable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 32 under 5 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt examination and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desired in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **June 23, 2005**

John K. Harrop
Registration No. 41,817
Andrews Kurth LLP
1701 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006
Tel. (202) 662-3050
Fax (202) 662-2739